THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

"*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men.*" Luke 2. 14.

"*How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth Salvation.*" Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. II. SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 1824. NO. 12.

[*From the Christian Reformer.*]

A FEW PLAIN QUESTIONS,

Proposed for the consideration of those who maintain the doctrine that Jesus Christ himself is truly God.

1. Are God and Christ two Beings, or one Being?

2. If the Father and the Christ (the anointed*) are two Beings, each of them God, are they not then two Gods?

3. If the Father and the Christ are but one Being and one God, then is it not evident, that what is true of the Father, must be true of Christ the Son and the anointed; Father and Son in this case being but two different names for one and the same God?

4. If the Christ (the anointed) be God, who anointed him? Did he anoint himself, being at once both the anointer and the anointed? See Luke iv. 18; Acts x. 38.

5. If the Father be unbegotten, and the Son begotten, and if they both are one and the same Being, then does it not follow that the same Being is both begotten and unbegotten?

6. If Christ, and the being styled in scripture the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, be one and the same Being, then does it not follow that Christ is the God and father of himself?

7. If the Father and the Son be the same individual Being, does it not follow that Christ is both the father and the son of himself? that he sent himself? ascended to himself when he ascended to His Father and our Father, to his God and our God, John xx. 17? and now sitteth at the right hand of himself? that he prayed to himself, when he prayed to his Father, whom he calls the only true God, John xvii. 3? and submitted his own will to the will of himself, when he prayed to the Father, Luke xxii. 42, "not my will but thine be done?" and forsook himself, when he prayed to the Father, Matt. xxvii. 46, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?

8. If Christ be God Almighty, possessed of all power, with what truth could he declare, that of his own self he could do nothing, John v. 19, 30; and that to sit on his right hand, and on his left, was not his to give, Matt. xx. 23?

9. Was God Almighty the infinite, eternal, and unchangeable Jehovah, once a helpless infant, indebted to the care of one of his own creatures for protection from injury, and for the supplies of animal life, and carried from place to place at the will of his nurse in her supporting arms?

10. Was the Being who alone is omnipresent, and who filleth heaven and earth with his presence, once confined in a mortal body, removable from place to place?

11. If Christ be the omniscient God, to whom are perfectly known all times and all events, past present, and to come, with what truth could he say. "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father," Mark xiii. 32?

12. Can it be true in any sense whatever that the very same Being could be ignorant of that day and at the same time know it; and what language could Christ have used, which would more clearly have expessed both his own ignorance and that of all other beings whatever, but the Father, concerning that day?

13. If Christ be God, the ever-lasting God, who only hath life and immortality in himself, who was it that expired on the cross, after praying, Luke xxiii. 46, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (or deliver up my breath)?

14. Did Christ know that he and his Father were one Being, when he said to the Jews, John viii. 17, 18, "It is written in your law, the testimony of *two* men is true I am *one* that bear witness of myself, and the *Father* who sent me beareth witness of me?"

---

* The Greek word CHRISTOS, or THE CHRIST, means THE ANOINTED.

15. If that saying of Christ's, John x. 30, "I and my Father are one," prove Christ and his Father to be one being, will not that other saying of his also prove his Father, himself and his diciples to be all but one Being, where he prays to his Father, John xvii. 11, 21, 22, 23, "That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that they may be one, as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfect in one"?

16. Did Christ know, or mean others to understand that he was God, when he said to the Jews, John viii. 40, "Ye seek to kill me, *a man* that hath told you the truth which I have heard of God"?

17. Does not the doctrine of the Deity or Godhead of Christ involve the scriptures in absurdity, do away all the piety and obedience of Jesus to his heavenly Father, and cast unjust reflections on the character of him, who came to bear witness to the truth, and in whose mouth was found no guile, but whose veracity may be fairly questioned if this doctrine be true?

18. It may be said that the doctrine is a mystery to be believed though not to be understood; but may not the same be said with equal reason of the popish doctrine of transubstantiation?

19. Did the apostle Peter know that Christ was God, when he called upon the assembled multitude to hear his words, and told them, Acts ii. 22 to 36 verse, that Jesus of Nazareth was a man approved of God by miracles, &c. which God did by him, and that after the Jews had crucified and slain him, God raised him from the dead, and that the same Jesus whom they had crucified was made by God both Lord and Christ?

20 If Christ be God, is he not Lord in and of himself, there being in this case no one superior to him to make him Lord? How is he then made a Lord and Christ, and Lord not to his own glory but to the glory of God the Father? Philip. ii. 11.

21. Was he God, or a superangelic being, or a crucified man, who was made Lord and Christ?

22. Was he God, or a superangelic being or a crucified man, whom the Jews slew, but whom God exalted to be a prince (or leader) and a Saviour, Acts v. 30, 31, xiii. 23.

23. If he were a crucified man, does it not follow that Christ the Saviour was a man and not God?

24. Did the apostle Paul understand Christ to be God, when he said, 1 Cor. xv. 21, "By man came (or cometh) the resurrection from the dead;" and Acts xvii. 31, "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world by that man whom he hath ordained and raised from the dead;" and 1 Cor. viii. 6, "to us there is but one God, the Father;" and again, Eph. iv. 5, 6, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, &c." and again 1 Tim. ii. 5, "There is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;" and again 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28, "that Christ must deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and be subject to him that put all things under him that God may be all in (or among) all." even that God whom the apostle Paul, and the other apostles so frequently denominate "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"? See 2 Cor. xi. 31, Eph. i. 3. 1 Pet. i. 3.

25. Did the apostle Paul understand Christ to be God, when he says, 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22, 23, "all things are your's, and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's, (not God, but God's) and in 1 Cor. xi. 3, "the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God"?

26. Did the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews know that Christ was God, or indeed more than a man, when he said that Christ was made like his brethren in all things, tempted in all points as we are, and made perfect through sufferings, Heb. ii. 10, 17, 18, iv. 15.

27. Did the apostle John (who is generally supposed to be the author of the book of Revelation) understand Christ to be God, or more than a man, when in the book of Revelation, Christ is described as the Lamb that was slain; and when in Rev. i. 1, it is said that God gave the revelation to Jesus Christ: who must have been previously ignorant of it, else how could it have been a revelation to him?

28. If Christ be not a man, truly and properly, and no more than a man, how could he be born by natural decent from David, according to Acts ii. 30, iii. 22, xiii. 23, Rom. i. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 8, and agreeably to the genealogy of Matthew's gospel?

29. What class of beings did that person belong to, who amidst the agonies of expiring nature prayed, "Father forgive

them, for they know not what they do," Luke xxiii. 34?

30. Did the real and very Christ himself, and in his proper person, actually die on the cross?

31. If we should say "no," to the preceding question, do we not deny the reality of Christ's death and thus deny the scriptures?

32. If the real and very Christ himself, and in his proper person died, was it a man, a superangelic being, or God himself that died was laid in the sepulchre, and on the third day was restored to life?

33. Did the Jews in reality crucify God Almighty? Was the Creator and upholder of all things put to death by his own creatures? and did the God of the universe actually expire?

34. If the God of nature had ceased to live, who then could have lived? Would not all nature in that instant, have been blotted out of existence and have become a blank?

[*From the Universalist Magazine.*]

Excommunication of Ezekiel W. Robbins.

On reading, in the last Magazine, the excommunication of Ezekiel W. Robbins, the following words struck my mind with a peculiar force; "In the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, I pronounce him to be excluded from the communion of the church." This sentence called up several queries. First; for what cause is Mr. Robbins excluded thus? The answer is, he was "convicted of heresy in denying the doctrine of endless punishment." Secondly; What is implied by saying that a man is excluded from the fellowship of a church, in the *name* of the Lord Jesus Christ, for denying the doctrine of endless punishment? Answer; this implies that *endless punishment* and *the name of the Lord Jesus Christ* are essential to each other, and that they reciprocally embrace, support and defend each other; and further, that the spirit of the one is the spirit of the other; so that the profession of the one is the profession of the other, and the denying of the one is the denying of the other.

Having proceeded thus far, a number of the most shocking and blasphemous absurdities rushed on my mind; and the name of "Abel L. Crandall," pastor of a Church in Adams, N. Y. stood pledged for the defence of them all.

The angel said to Joseph; "Thou shalt call his *name* Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." According to this angelic declaration, the *name* of Jesus implies the salvation of sinners; but it is in this *name* that the Rev. Abel L. Crandall, pastor of a Congregational Church in Adams, N. Y. excludes a pious young student in divinity, from fellowship, for denying the doctrine of endless punishment! Is the doctrine of endless punishment and the doctrine of the salvation of sinners the same? The prophet says, "In his name shall the Gentiles trust." Does this mean that the Gentiles shall *trust* in the doctrine of endless punishment! This would correspond, truly, with common usage; for as this doctrine of endless punishment is made a term of fellowship in the church, whoever believes it is thereby rendered worthy of said fellowship; so that whoever trusts in the doctrine of endless punishment shall be as mount Zion, that never shall be moved!

Jesus said; "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." According to the absurdity under consideration, the meaning is, where two or three are gathered together in the doctrine of endless punishment, there is Christ in the midst of them! Solomon says; "The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it, and is safe." This answers well to our subject.—The doctrine of endless punishment is a strong tower, and in this tower our *righteous* people are safe! Their confidence is, that they shall be saved in an everlasting salvation, because they believe in the doctrine of endless punishment! They say, in reference to this subject; it is best to be on the safe side; and though the doctrine of universal salvation may be true, yet it is best to believe the contrary that we may be sure. Again, the wise man says; "A good name is better than precious ointment;" and it is very clear that there is no *ointment* that will answer in the room of endless punishment David, speaking of the goodness and pleasantness of brethren dwelling together in unity, compared it, among other things, to the "ointment on Aaron's head, that ran down upon his beard, and reached to the skirts of his garment," and said that, "there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life forever more." It seems that Br. Robbins was desirous to dwell with his brethren of the church in unity, and firmly believed in the doctrine of life forevermore, but all this availed him nothing;

he lacked the sweet savour of the doctrine of endless punishment; and therefore, with all his love and unity he was "excluded from the communion of the church!"

Jesus said to his disciples, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name that will I do." According to our subject, all the prayers which are offered in the name of Christ must be in conformity to the doctrine of endless punishment, and then they will be duly answered! Jesus promised that "the comforter" should come in his name. But does it not shock our feelings to say, that the divine comforter comes in the doctrine of endless punishment? Who ever received any comfort from this doctrine? But after all, it must be allowed, that *in this name*, the clergy "have done many *wonderful works.*" H. B.

[*From the Freeman's Journal, of* 1805.]

The following is an extract of an original letter from the venerable Franklin, to a minister of a church in the south part of New-Jersey, which has recently been discovered among some old family papers. It is a composition perfectly in the manner and spirit of that great and worthy man.

Philadelphia, June 6, 1753.

Dear Sir,—I received your kind letter of the third inst. and am glad to hear that you increase in strength. I hope you will continue mending, until you recover your former health and firmness. Let me know whether you still use the cold bath, and what effect it has.

As to the kindness you mention, I wish it could have been of more serious service to you; but if it had, the only thanks I should desire, are, that you would always be ready to serve any other person who may need your assistance, and so let good offices go round; for mankind are all of a family. For my own part, when I am employed in serving others, I do not look upon myself as conferring favours, but as paying debts. In my travels, and since my settlement, I have received much kindness from men, to whom I shall never have an opportunity of making the least direct return; and numberless mercies from God, who is infinitely above being benefited by our services. These kindnesses from men I can, therefore, only return to their fellow-men; and I can only shew my gratitude to God by a readiness to help his other children, and my brethren; for I do not think that thanks and compliments, though repeated weekly, can discharge our real obligations, to each other, and much less to our Creator.

You will see, in this my notion of good works, that I am far from expecting to merit heaven by them. By heaven we understand a state of happiness, infinite in degree and eternal in duration. I can do nothing to deserve such a reward. He that for giving a draught of water to a thirsty person should expect to be paid with a good plantation, would be modest in his demands, compared with those who think they deserve heaven for the little good they do on earth. Even the mixed imperfect pleasures we enjoy in this world, are rather from God's goodness than our merit; how much more so the happiness of heaven? For my part, I have not the vanity to think I deserve it, the folly to expect it, or the ambition to desire it; but content myself in submitting to the disposal of that God who made me, who has hitherto preserved and blessed me, and in whose fatherly goodness I may well confide, that he never will make me miserable, and that the affliction I may at any time suffer, may tend to my benefit.

The faith you mention has doubtless its use in the world; but I wish it were more productive of good works than I have generally seen it. I mean real good works! works of kindness, charity, mercy, and public spirit; not holy-day keeping, sermon hearing or reading, performing church ceremonies, or making long prayers, filled with flatteries and compliments, despised even by wise men, and much less capable of pleasing the Deity.

The worship of God is a duty; the hearing and reading may be useful; but if men rest in hearing and praying, as too many do, it is as if the tree should value itself on being watered and putting forth leaves, though it never produced any fruit.

Your good master thought much less of these outward appearances than many of his modern disciples. He preferred the *doers* of the word to the hearers: the son that seemingly refused to obey his father, and yet performed his commands, to him that professed his readiness, but neglected the work, the heretical but charitable Samaritan to the uncharitable but orthodox priest and sanctified Levite. And those who gave food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, and raiment to the naked, entertainment to the stranger, and relief to the

sick, and although they never heard of his name, he declares shall in the last day be accepted; when those who cry Lord! Lord! who value themselves on their faith, though great enough to perform miracles, but have neglected good works, shall be rejected. He professed that he came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance, which implied his modest opinion, that there were some in his time so good that they need not hear even him for improvement. But now-a-days we have scarcely a little parson, that does not think it the duty of every man within his reach to sit under his petty ministration, and that whoever omits this offends God. I wish to such more humility, and to you health and firmness.

Being your friend and servant.
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

PUBLIC CONTROVERSY.

A public discussion of a Theological nature has recently occurred in the city of Philadelphia, between the Rev. W. L. M'Calla, a Presbyterian; and the Rev. A. Kneeland, a Universalist. The discussion was continued four days. From the nature and importance of the subject and the reputed abilities of the Disputants, this controversy must have been deeply interesting to the auditory.

[*From the Phil. Gazetteer.*]

The Theological Discussion on the question, "Is the punishment of the wicked absolutely eternal, &c." was closed on Friday last, at half past 6 o'clock, P. M. The church was thronged the whole time, and on the last afternoon the crowd was immense. Each party spoke *ten hours*, in speeches of 30 minutes each, according to the rules prescribed.

The argument principally turned on the will of God. Mr. M'Calla acknowledged that if it could be proved that the will of God (who *will* have all men to be saved-&c.) was his will of *purpose*, and not merely a will of *precept*,—which might be counteracted, then it must be logically concluded that all men, universally, will be saved. This argument was fairly met and completely silenced. It was shown that the counsel of God must stand, and that he will do all his pleasure. Isa. xlvi. 10. That the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in the hand of the Messiah. (Isa. liii. 10,) who came not *to condemn* (*ina krino*) the world but *to save* (*ina Soso*) the world, (John xii. 47;) and that no weapon formed against him shall prosper. Isa. liv. 17. That the *will* of God is according to his *good pleasure*, which he *purposed* in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in Heaven, and which are on earth; even in him. Eph. i. 9, 10. To this argument, although he had the last speech, Mr. M. made no reply.

There was an *aionian* fight about the words *aion*, *aionion*, &c. which was mostly lost to the audience, and which ended nearly where it commenced, certainly, however, without any thing being gained in favor of endless misery; and which was sufficient to convince every rational mind of the weakness of the cause which depends on such nice verbal criticisms for its support. No rational man can believe any thing esssential to salvation which is not plainly and clearly revealed, and which depends on something better than such equivocal terms for its support.

Mr. M. admitted, however, that the word *aion* from whence comes *aionion*, is equivocal and may mean a man's life, an age, a dispensation, the duration of the earth, as well as an absolute eternity.

Mr. K. from the very first, and repeatedly, called on Mr. M. to show the *law* which required *absolutely eternal* punishment as a penalty for its transgression.—This argument was not met at all, or even attempted, by Mr. M. He also challenged him to show that God had ever threatened man with punishment after death, either in the writings of Moses, or of all the prophets. These two arguments, which were principally relied upon by Mr. K. were never met by Mr. M.

The whole discussion has been taken down in short hand, by a stenographer employed for the purpose, and several others took notes, and it is expected that the whole will be published to the world. It has been one of the most important discussions which ever took place in this city, or perhaps in the world, and which will be read with interest by generations yet to come.

[FOR THE HERALD.]

Brother Morse, Sir—In looking over the columns of the New-York Statesman of the 20th July, I could not but observe an editorial remark upon the theological combat, (as he was pleased to term it)

that took place in Philadelphia between a Presbyterian and a Universalist Minister, on the question whether "the punishment of the wicked will be absolutely eternal." Says the editor of the Statesman, "these disputants have not been able to make one hair black or white; and our impression is, that such exhibitions ought to be discountenanced by the public, as tending to bring religion itself into disrepute." "As tending to bring religion *itself* into disrepute."! Thought I, how unlike mine, is this view of real religion. When the purest metals will become tarnished and black by scouring & polishing, then, and not until then, will *religion itself* become obscured and disreputable by being contrasted with false theories, at the bar of reason and common sense, corroborated by the concurrent testimony of scripture. The remarker says, the disputants did not make one hair black or white. Perhaps he is less afraid of their reasonings changing *colors* than opinions: for I think he yet retains of the leaven of modern Pharisaism, of which he formerly disseminated the plants, which flourish better in the *dark*, under the cover of superstition and bigotry, than in the light of scripture, reason and common sense.

ONEIDA.

[*From the Christian Register.*]

Extracts from a very sensible American writer, on the origin of the doctrine of the Trinity.

"In Egypt and the adjacent countries, the greatest part embraced the opinion of Origen, who held that the *Son* was *in God* that which *reason* is *in man*; and that the Holy Ghost was nothing more than the *divine or active force.*"

Both according to Mosheim and Milner, Origen was remarkable for giving an allegorical meaning to the language of scripture. He flourished in the third century, and, according to Mosheim, "he was a man of vast and uncommon abilities, and the greatest luminary of the Christian Church which his age exhibited to view."

Another passage from Mosheim may now be introduced, which is of considerable importance to the present inquiry.—In page 423, Vol. I. the Doctor states, that in the year 381, Theodosius called a council, which convened at Constantinople, and says, "A hundred and fifty bishops who were present at this council, gave the *finishing touch* to what the council of Nice *had left imperfect*, and fixed in a full and determinate manner the doctrine of *three persons in one God*, which is as yet received among the generality of Christians."

From this passage it is evident, that in the opinion of Mosheim, the Nicene council did not, in any definite manner, affirm the doctrine of three persons in one God; yet he supposes they did something towards that doctrine, but *left it imperfect.* But the obliging Doctor has told in the most unequivocal language, *when the doctrine of three persons in one God* had its "*finishing touch*," and was adopted as an article of faith. It was in the year 381, about 56 years after the council of Nice. Until this, it does not appear that any church or any council had, in a definite manner affirmed the doctrine.

Had this doctrine been of divine origin, & of such infinite importance as some have supposed, we might naturally expect to find that it had received its "*finishing touch*" in the sacred oracles. But since it is not to be found in the Bible, we cannot blame the doctor for speaking of it as the *work of men*. Nor can we much wonder that the "*finishing touch*" was delayed till so near the end of the fourth century, as the year A. D. 381.

The fourth century was very fruitful of *inventions* in favor of the doctrine of three persons in one God. Mr. Milner has recorded one *invention* of this century, and named the author. He says, "Flavian was the first who invented the doxology, "Glory be to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.'" Vol. 2. p. 93.

Before I had read this account, I had noticed several doxologies in the Bible, but not one in which the Holy Gost is so much as named. And I was glad to find, in Mr. Milner, *when* and *by whom this invention* and *innovation* in Christian worship first took place. But if the Holy Spirit be a person, and equal with the Father, is it not astonishing that neither Christ nor his apostles, nor any Christian before Flavian, had taught the church to include the Spirit, as a person, in a doxology or ascription of praise? And the circumstance that "Flavian was the *first* who *invented*" such a "doxology," is evidence to my mind that the doctrine of three persons in one God, had never been believed by the church of God prior to the fourth century. And this very doxology invented by Flavian, might have great influence in preparing the minds of the people for the "*finishing touch*" to that doctrine.

Mr. Milner has given some account of the council at Constantinople, in A. D. 381. He says, There came together 350 bishops—the council was very confused and disorderly, greatly inferior in wisdom and piety to the council of Nice.—"Faction was high and charity was low at that time."

"This council very accurately defined the doctrine of the trinity, and, enlarged a little the Nicene creed, they delivered it as we now have it in our common service." The Macedonian heresy, which blasphemed the Holy Ghost, gave occasion to a more explicit representation of the third person in the Trinity." Vol. 2. p. 184, 185.

We may here remark—

1. If Mr. Milner be correct in stating the number of this council at 350 bishops, and Mosheim be correct as to the number who gave the "*finishing touch*" to the doctrine of three persons in one God, it will follow that this "*finishing touch*" was given by the *minor part* of the council, For Mosheim states the number who did this work, at 150 bishops. He does not say how many more were present—"But *faction* was *high* and *charity* was *low* at this time:" and by this we may perhaps reconcile the two accounts.

2. According to Milner this council "enlarged a little the Nicene creed," and gave a more *explicit representation of the third person in the Trinity.*" It does not appear that the Nicene council gave any "representation" of the *Holy Spirit* as a *person*, nor any idea of three distinct persons in one God. And the additions made to their creed by the council at Constantinople, may perhaps be justly attributed to the *spirit* and *character* of the council as given by Mr. Milner. He not only states that faction was high and charity was low at this time, but also that the council was very *confused* and *disorderly*, greatly *inferior* in *wisdom* and *piety* to the council at Nice.

That the church in the fourth century made rapid advances in degeneracy, is very evident both from Mosheim and Milner. And if we may give credit to what had been collected from these two historians, are we not justly entitled to this conclusion, that the doctrine of three distinct persons in one God had its *birth* in the *allegory* of Origen, its growth in the *degeneracy* of the church, its maturity or "*finishing touch*" in a very confused and disorderly council, when faction was high and charity was low? and shall it be deemed a *crime* to call in question the correctness of a doctrine thus *produced*, or to bring it to the Oracles of God for examination?

If ever the *character* of a council might give rise to suspicions respecting the correctness of their result, such was the character of the council that gave the "*finishing touch*" to the doctrine of three persons in one God. A worse character was never perhaps given to a council which bore the Christian name, than Mr. Milner has given to the council of Constantinople. Yet it appears that this is the first council that ever asserted the doctrine of three persons in one God.

K.

To the Editor of the Herald.

Dear Sir—I believe it will be almost universally admitted that there are but three distinct systems of *doctrine* in the christian world, viz. Calvinism, Arminianism, and Universalism. There are also three distinct forms of government, viz. Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy. The following inquiry naturally suggests itself: is there not a striking similarity between the three distinct systems of doctrine, and the three different forms of government? Although I am much opposed to the blending of politics and religion, yet I cannot but think that the one may have had some influence upon the other.* I recollect a conversation that happened in my hearing (perhaps twenty years ago, when politics ran high in Connecticut) between two of my neighbors, whom I knew to differ as much in politics as in religion: the one being a decided Calvinist, and the other knew not what to believe. On our return from meeting immediately after hearing a sermon *on the sovereign decrees of God*, in which the preacher set forth the doctrine of John Calvin in its most awful colors. "Well," said the Calvinist to his neighbor, "how did you like the preaching?" "Not at all," replies the neighbor, "but I think it a very consistent doctrine for a great part of the world. I think it peculiarly adapted to monarchial governments. Only persuade men to admit *tyranny* and *inequality* in heaven, and

---

* May not this account for the preaching of *Politics* a few years since by the Clergy of New-England?

they may be the more easily brought to submit to *tyrants* and *unequal privileges* on earth. But how the people of these United States can foster such a doctrine, I know not." Here a deep silence ensued, and the conversation ended. Perhaps a whole sermon would not have made a more lasting impression upon my mind. If the doctrine of Calvin comports so well with Monarchy: why may not the doctrine of Arminianism be compared to Aristocracy, where a few men by their riches, or by their works, usurp all authority? In a Republican form of Government, all participate in the privileges of Society; so that I think the *political Creed* or Constitution of the United States, agrees very well with the *religious Creed* of a UNIVERSALIST.

July 5, 1824.

[FOR THE HERALD.]

MR. EDITOR—I understand there is a report in circulation which states, that I have renounced the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness, and have embraced that of never-ending, unmerciful punishment!

This, therefore, is to inform the public that the above report is entirely false.—Notwithstanding a continual stream of *fire* and *brimstone* has issued from the mouth of the *Priest* for a number of weeks past, still I am not so completely suffocated by the smoke of its burning, as to give up my own salvation, or that of any of my fellow beings, and I as firmly believe in the doctrine of the "*Restitution of all things*," as I do that God will "gather together in one all things in Christ," or that the "creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." I have for a long time suspected that partialists were in the habit of telling large stories respecting Universalists, but now I know the fact, and it is hoped that the authors of the above report will consider well the impropriety of such proceedings, and learn in future, if they speak at all, to speak the truth.

WILLIS HOSKINS.

Lowville July 31, 1824.

"Though a sinner do evil a hundred times, and his days be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God, which fear before him."

Eccl.

POETRY.

The following beautiful Hymn, from the Asiatic Journal, is by the Right Rev. Reginal Heber, lord bishop of Calcutta.

HYMN.

By cool Siloam's shady fountain,
How sweet the lily grows!
How sweet the breath on yonder mountain
Of Sharon's dewy rose!

Lo! such the child whose young devotion
The paths of peace has trod;
Whose secret soul's instinctive motion
Tends upwards to his God.

By cool Siloam's shady fountain,
The lily must decay;
The rose that blooms on yonder mountain
Must shortly fade away.

A little while, the better morrow
Of man's maturer age,
Will shake the soul with cankering sorrow,
And passion's stormy rage.

O Thou! whose every year untainted
In changeless virtue shone,
Preserve the flowers thy grace has planted,
And keep them still thine own.

DIED.—At New Berlin, N. Y. July 14, 1824, the Rev. Arthur Field, aged 25 years. He was a dutiful child, a tender husband, an affectionate friend, a social and agreeable companion; and sustained the character and performed the duties of a minister of the gospel with ability and faithfulness. During a protracted and painful consumption, he manifested a cheerful patience, and a truly christian resignation. He anticipated the wishes of his friends, by assuring them in the moment of dissolution of the increasing confidence of his faith in the salvation of all men. Every arrangement was made by his own direction, for his funeral, and bidding an affectionate farewell to his friends, he died with composure, and in full hope of a joyous immortality with all mankind.

The fraternity of Masons, of which he was a member, attended in the usual forms on his funeral. A discourse by Rev. S. R. Smith was delivered from 1 Cor. xv. 26, to a very numerous and attentive auditory, who evinced their respect for the deceased, and their reverence of his virtues. His numerous relatives derive comfort from his example.—*Gos. Inquirer.*

W. WOODWARD, PRINTER.